



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,296	03/01/2002	Anil Seth	1488.008US1	2127
21186	7590	10/20/2005	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH			ROMANO, JOHN J	
1600 TCF TOWER				
121 SOUTH EIGHT STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			2192	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/087,296	SETH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John J. Romano	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment and response received July 27th, 2005, responding to the January 25th, 2005, Office action provided in the rejections of claims 1-44. Claims 1-44 remain pending in the application and which have been fully considered by the examiner.

Applicant arguing for the claims being patentable over Bartley in view of Li (see pages 12-14 of the amendment and response) primarily based on assertions on pages 12 and 13, where applicant contends that the references are not properly combinable, and arguments pertaining to the dependent claims are not persuasive, as will be addressed under Prior Art's Arguments – Rejections section at item 2 and the claim rejections below. Thus, the rejection of the claims over prior art in the previous Office action is maintained in light of the necessitated additional clarifications provided hereon and **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Prior Art's Arguments – Rejections

2. Applicant's arguments filed July 27th, 2005, in particular on pages 12 and 13, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. For example,

(A) In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, (page 12 of the amendment and response, last paragraph), the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case,

(B) **Bartley** discloses "These segments would be of longer duration than some predetermined threshold" (Column 7, lines 42-43), wherein the threshold inherently must be predetermined or user specified. **Bartley** then teaches in the next paragraph "Locating program segments during which a *functional unit* is not used may be done by either static or *dynamic program analysis.*", (*emphasis added*), (Column 7, lines 47-49), or real-time constraints, wherein the predetermined time threshold is a real-time time constraint or a user specified real time constraint. Thus, contradicting to Applicant's assertion at page 13, **Bartley** does relate to satisfying user-specified real time

constraints or program performance as currently claimed, thereby allowing one to determine where to put the power down instructions, as Applicant expressly argued for. Therefore, the examiner maintains the rejection in regard to reasons for combination of **Bartley and Li.**

(C) It should be noted that the plain language of the claim merely called for “...inserting the power down instructions in the selected locations to reduce the power consumption...”, (emphasis added), that is to say reduce energy consumption, energy dissipation or energy conservation per se, and that should not be required to read as “...powering down different functional units...” as applicant expressly argued for.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., “...powering down different functional units...”) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Examiner would like to thank applicant for pointing out Examiners' inadvertent admission of the word “no” in the cited quote. Examiner agrees with Applicants' statement that it would not make sense with the word “no” included, and further agrees that the quote as cited herein, and in the response by applicant, is the correct wording and meaning of **Bartley's** disclosure.

(D) In response to applicant's argument that **Bartley and Li** describe different architecture and method, (page 13 of the amendment and response, second

paragraph), it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, both references are reasonably pertinent to the particular problem of energy conservation. **Bartley** discloses "... apart from energy conservation, power efficiency is a concern for battery-operated processor-based equipment..." (Column 1, lines 20-22). While, **Li** teaches "Energy efficiency is a hot topic in embedded system design. As mobile computing systems (e.g. cellular phones, laptop computers, video cams, etc.) become more popular, how to lengthen the battery life of these systems becomes a critical issue" (Page 1, lefthand column, under Introduction, first full paragraph). Thus, the examiner maintains the position that **Bartley** and **Li** are reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, namely energy conservation.

(E) Independent claims 14, 24 and 34 are rejected for the reasons stated above, as Applicant relies on the same argument as noted above. Thus, Claims 3-10, 16-21, 26-31 and 37-42 are also rejected.

Claim Rejections

3. Claims 1-44, are pending claims, and stand finally rejected in light of the additional clarifications provided and/or addressed at item 2 above, Prior Art's Arguments – Rejections and as provided below for completeness.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, 11-15, 22-25, 32-36, 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartley, US 6,219,796 (hereinafter **Bartley**), in view of Y. Li et al. A framework for estimating and minimizing energy dissipation of embedded hw/sw systems, (hereinafter **Li**).

6. In regard to claim 1, **Bartley** discloses:

- “*A method of compiling computer code including power-down instructions to reduce power consumption during execution of the code...*” (E.g., see Figure 7 & Column 2, lines 62-67), wherein it is inherent that the code is efficient when executed by a processor.
- “*...identifying one or more potential locations in the computer code where the power-down instructions can be inserted...*” (E.g., see Figure 7 & Column 7, lines 10-21), wherein the potential locations are identified by scanning the code.
- “*...selecting locations to insert the power-down instructions from the identified potential locations in the code based on reducing power*

consumption ..." (E.g., see Figure 7 & Column 7, lines 39-43), wherein the locations are determined by a predetermined threshold duration of non-use.

- "...*inserting the power-down instructions in the selected locations to reduce the power consumption during the execution of the code ...*" (E.g., see Figure 7 & Column 7, lines 43-46), wherein the power modifying or power-down instruction is then inserted to reduce the power consumption.

But **Bartley** does not expressly disclose "...*satisfying user-specified real-time constraints...*". However, **Li** discloses:

- "...*satisfying user-specified real-time constraints...*" (E.g., see Figure 5 & Page 4, Section 4.3), wherein the user specifies one of many multiple objective optimization goals via performance constraints.

Bartley and **Li** are analogous art because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely, an optimizing compiler with the means to reduce power or energy consumption. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine user specified real-time constraints with **Bartleys'** power reduction methods. The motivation is disclosed by **Bartley**, as he refers to program segments having a duration longer than a "predetermined threshold." (Column 7, lines 42-43), wherein it is obvious the threshold may be determined by a user either via a user selected algorithm or other user input.

Art Unit: 2192

7. In regard to claim 2, the rejections of base claim 1 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Bartley** discloses:

- “*... wherein the code is written for a microprocessor having distinct functional units.*” (E.g. see Figure 7 & Column 3, lines 3-8) wherein the common characteristic is any processor or microprocessor that has more than one independent or distinct functional units.

8. In regard to claim 11, the rejections of base claim 1 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Li** discloses:

- “*... the number of power-down instructions that can be inserted in an execution path, including one or more identified potential locations.*” (E.g. see Table 2 & Section 5.2), wherein the time improvement or a negative time improvement as a performance constraint is taught and may be used to limit the number of instructions inserted.

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine **Li**’s user specified real-time constraints with **Bartleys**’ power reduction methods. The motivation is disclosed by **Bartley**, as he refers to program segments having a duration longer than a “predetermined threshold.” (Column 7, lines 42-43), wherein it is obvious the threshold may be determined by a user either via a user selected algorithm or other user input. Furthermore, the segment is a direct relationship to **Li**’s teaching of user specified performance constraint of time or execution cycles executed as a consequence of the energy savings. Additionally, **Bartley** provided the motivation for a number of power down instructions (E.g. see,

Art Unit: 2192

Figure 5 & Column 2, line 11) wherein, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to factor in particular power down instructions and the number of such instructions, based on the energy savings in relation to the overhead drawback.

9. In regard to claim 12, the rejections of base claim 11 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Li** discloses:

- “*...the number of additional cycles of execution time the user is willing to incur due to an insertion of the power-down instruction at each of the identified potential locations.*” (E.g. see Table 2 & Section 5.2), wherein the “...minimum energy dissipation while not exceeding the budget of clock cycles to execute...” is taught.

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine user specified real-time constraints with **Bartleys'** power reduction methods. The motivation is disclosed by **Bartley**, as he refers to program segments having a duration longer than a “predetermined threshold.” (Column 7, lines 42-43), wherein it is obvious the threshold may be determined by a user either via a user selected algorithm or other user input.

10. In regard to claim 13, the rejections of base claim 11 and claim 12 are incorporated. Furthermore **Bartley** discloses:

- “*...inserting power-up instruction in the code to restore at least one functional unit to a ready state powered-down by the inserted power-down instructions..*” (E.g. see Figure 7 & Column 6, lines 8-19), wherein the power up instruction is inserted.

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine **Li's** user specified real-time constraints with **Bartleys'** power reduction methods. The motivation is disclosed by **Bartley**, as he refers to program segments having a duration longer than a "predetermined threshold." (Column 7, lines 42-43), wherein it is obvious the threshold may be determined by a user either via a user selected algorithm or other user input. Additionally, the segment is a direct relationship to **Li's** teaching of user specified performance constraint of time or execution cycles executed as a consequence of the energy savings.

11. As per claims **14, 15, 22** and **23**, this is a computer-readable medium version of the claimed method discussed above, in claims **1, 2, 11** and **13**, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above, wherein **Bartley** also discloses "a storage device and external memory" (16), (E.g. see, Figure 1 and associated text).

12. As per claims **24, 25, 32** and **33**, this is a computer system version of the claimed method discussed above, in claims **1, 2, 11** and **13**, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above, wherein **Bartley** also discloses a computer system (E.g. see, Figure 1 and associated text).

13. In regard to claim **34**, the rejections of claim **1** are incorporated. Additionally, **Bartley** discloses:

- "*A computer readable medium having a computer program including instructions for causing a computer to perform a method of selectively controlling power to different functional units of the computer, the*

instructions comprising..." (E.g., see Figure 7 & Column 7, lines 10-

21), wherein it is inherent that the instructions have to be on a

computer-readable medium to be scanned by a computer process.

- *"...power-down instructions inserted in the computer-program in selected locations based on reducing power consumption..." (E.g., see Figure 7 & Column 7, lines 10-21), wherein the potential locations are identified by scanning the code.*
- *"...the power-down instructions in the selected locations reduce the power consumption during the execution of the code..." (E.g., see Figure 7 & Column 2, lines 6-13), wherein the locations are determined by a predetermined threshold duration of non-use.*

14. As per claims **35, 36, 43** and **44**, the base claim **34** is incorporated. Furthermore, this is another computer-readable medium version of the claimed method discussed above, in claims **1, 2, 11** and **13**, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above, (E.g. see Figure 1 & associated text), wherein a computer readable medium is shown (16).

15. Claims **3-10, 16-21, 26-31** and **37-42** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Bartley** in view of **Li** and further in view of **G. Ramalingam**. Data Flow Frequency Analysis, SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, 1996, (hereinafter **Ramalingam**).

16. In regard to claim 3, the rejections of base claim 2 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Bartley** discloses:

- “*... based on the functional units not being used in the potential locations, wherein the functional units not being used are determined based on functional unit usage ...*” (E.g. see Figure 7 & Column 7, lines 10-21), wherein the functional units are not used.

But **Bartley** does not specifically disclose a “*...transfer functions at each of the potential locations as specified in standard monotone data-flow frameworks.*” However, **Ramalingam** discloses:

- “*...transfer functions at each of the potential locations as specified in standard monotone data-flow frameworks.*” (E.g. see Section 3, The expected Frequency of Dataflow Facts), wherein the use of transfer functions as specified in standard monotone data-flow frameworks is taught.

The combined teaching and **Ramalingam** are analogous art because they are both concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely program optimization via standard analysis. Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine a transfer function with static analysis method disclosed by the combined art of an optimizing compiler embodiment. The motivation is disclosed by **Bartley**, “Locating program segments during which a functional unit is not used may be done by either static or dynamic program analysis.” (Column 7, lines 47-49).

17. In regard to claim 4, the rejections of base claim 3 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Bartley** discloses:

- “... statically analyzing processor cycles prior to executing the code.”
(E.g. see Figure 7 & Column 7, lines 47-52), wherein the processor or execute cycles are estimated by the compiler for static analysis.

18. In regard to claim 5, the rejections of base claim 4 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Bartley** discloses:

- “...the text in the code...” (E.g. see Figure 7 & Column 7, lines 47-52), wherein the start and stop points exist in the program segments or text in the code.

19. In regard to claim 6, the rejections of base claim 3 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Bartley** discloses:

- “...a first power-down instruction operable to reduce power to all of the at least one functional unit, such that the functional unit is placed in a low state of readiness and a second power-down instruction operable to reduce power to only a part of the at least one functional unit, such that the functional unit is placed in an intermediate state of readiness.”
(E.g. see Figure 6 & Column 6, line 60 – Column 7, line 3), wherein the “less ready” or low state and a “more ready” or intermediated state of readiness are taught.

20. In regard to claim 7, the rejections of base claim 1 are incorporated. But Bartley does not expressly disclose “...executing the code to generate power-profiling and

execution path-profiling information..." or "...assigning a weight factor based on the profile information...". However, **Li** discloses:

- “*...executing the code to generate power-profiling information associated with each of the identified potential locations...*” (E.g. see Figure 2 & Page 3, Section 3.4), wherein Figure 2 shows the program execution trace which generates the software performance model and the software energy model is also generated based on the execution trace and then coupled with the memory energy models to account for the total system energy generating power information or a power-profile.
- “*...assigning a weight factor to each of the identified potential locations based on the generated power-profiling...*” (E.g. see Figure 5 & Section 4.2), wherein the EES/CSI ratio or weight factor prioritizes and then gets assigned a probability based on the ratio. Further the EES/CSI numbers are based on the profile information. Additionally, the user specifies constraints to be met in real-time in section 4.3.

But the combined teaching of **Bartley** and **Li** do not expressly disclose “*...executing the code to generate path-profiling information...*”. However, **Ramalingam** discloses:

- “*...path-profiling information...*” (E.g. see Section 1), wherein the path-profiling information is used to estimate probability.

- “*...and path-profiling information; and selecting the locations to insert the power-down instruction from the identified locations based on the assigned weight factors...*” (E.g. see Section 3, lemma 2), wherein the result is “*...weighted...*”.

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine power and path profile information with **Bartleys'** power reduction methods. Motivation was provided by **Bartley**, when he referred to static and dynamic analysis utilizing execution cycles, loop cycles and other “statistical predictions.” (Column 7, lines 47-52), wherein it would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, that **Li's** constraints and profile algorithm would be beneficial to the efficiency of a power reduction embodiment disclosed by **Bartley**. Furthermore, motivation was provided by **Li** (Figure 2) wherein, the program execution trace used by **Li** would only been beneficial if there was a probability that the path will actually be used.

21. In regard to claim 8, the rejections of base claim 7 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Li** discloses:

- “*...generating execution probability of each of the identified potential locations based on the generated path-profiling information.*” (E.g. see Section 3, lemma 2), wherein the result is “*...weighted...*” by the probability of execution of the path.

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine probability derived from path profile

information with **Bartleys'** power reduction methods in order to increase the efficiency by increasing the depth of the analysis.

22. In regard to claim 9, the rejections of base claim 8 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Li** discloses:

- “*...extracting potential energy savings for each of the identified potential locations using the generated power profile analysis information...*” (E.g. see Figure 5 & Page 4, Section 4.2), wherein the EES is the estimated energy savings.
- “*...assigning the weight factor to each of the identified potential locations based on the extracted potential energy savings and the generated execution probability.*” (E.g. see Figure 5 & Page 4, Section 4.2), wherein the EES/CSI ratio or weight factor prioritizes and then gets assigned a probability based on the ratio. Further the EES/CSI numbers are based on the program execution trace or generated path-profiling information.

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine potential energy savings derived from power profile information with **Bartleys'** power reduction methods in order to increase the efficiency by increasing the depth of the analysis.

23. In regard to claim 10, the rejections of base claim 9 are incorporated.

Furthermore, **Li** discloses:

- “*...executing the code to assign a first weight factor based on the extracted potential energy savings to each of the identified potential locations...*” (E.g. see Figure 2 & Column 3, lines 3-8), wherein the software performance model includes the product of execution cycles of a given instruction and the number of times an instruction is used or path profile and power information is factored to derive a weight factor.
- “*... executing the code to assign a second weight factor based on execution probability at each of the identified potential locations...*” (E.g. see Figure 2 & Column 3, lines 3-8), wherein the software performance model includes the product of execution cycles of a given instruction and the number of times an instruction is used or path profile.
- “*...computing a product of the first and second weight factors for each of the identified potential locations; calculating the weight factor for each of the identified potential locations based on the computed product of the first and second weight factors; and assigning the calculated weight factor to each of the identified potential locations.*” (E.g. see Figure 2 & Column 3, lines 3-8), wherein the software performance model includes the product of execution cycles of a given instruction and the number of times an instruction is used or path profile and the weight factor is assigned based on a product of weighted factors of both the energy savings or power profile and

execution probability. The EES/CSI ratio as disclosed above is based on the products of path and profile information.

24. As per claims **16-21**, this is a computer-readable medium version of the claimed method discussed above, in claims **3, 4** and **7-10**, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above, (E.g. see Figure 1 & associated text), wherein a computer readable medium is shown (16).
25. As per claims **26-31**, this is a computer system version of the claimed method discussed above, in claims **3, 4** and **7-10**, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above, (E.g. see Figure 1 & Column 3, lines 3-8), wherein a computer system is shown.
26. As per claims **37-42**, the base claim **34** and **35** are incorporated. Furthermore, this is another computer system version of the claimed method discussed above, in claims **3, 4** and **7-10**, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above, (E.g. see Figure 2 & Column 3, lines 3-8), wherein a computer system is shown.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John J. Romano whose telephone number is (571) 272-3872. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JJR



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER